



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/779,306	02/07/2001	Marc Segre	RPS920000029US1	4556

7590 05/02/2003
BRACEWELL & PATTERSON LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
P O BOX 969
AUSTIN, TX 78767

EXAMINER

SHAPIRO, LEONID

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2673

DATE MAILED: 05/02/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/779,306

Applicant(s)

SEGRE, MARC

Examiner

Leonid Shapiro

Art Unit

2673



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 April 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 6, 7, 9, 13-15 and 18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 6, 7, 9, 13-15 and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 9 is objected, as it depends on cancelled claim 8.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2, 6-7, 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grigor et al. (US Patent No. 6,473,101 B1)

As to claim 1, Grigor et al. teaches a set of data processing systems operating utilizing a single set of input devices with: a single set of input devices including a pointing device (See Fig. 1a, item 30, in description See Col. 3, Lines 4-7); at least two data processing systems sharing the single set of input devices, each data processing system having a display area logically arranged to have at least one boundary in common with the display area for another data processing system, wherein a pointer driven cursor controlled by the pointing device is located within a display area for an active data processing system receiving input signals from the single set of input devices (See Fig. 1a, items 16,18,20,22, in description See from Col. 2,

Art Unit: 2673

Lines 59 to Col.3, Line 64); switching means including an input controller coupled to single set of input device and to each of at least two data processing systems (See Figs. 1a,b, items 30,72,62, in description See from Col. 3, Line 65 to Col 4, Line 55), wherein switching means, responsive to the active data processing system signaling movement of the cursor past a common boundary between two display areas, for automatically switching transmission of signals from the single set of input devices from the active data processing system to another data processing system corresponding to a display area sharing the common boundary with the display area for the active data processing system, wherein the other data processing system becomes the active data processing system (See Fig. 5a,b, items 202,204,207, in description See from Col. 6, Line 67 to Col. 7, Line 17).

Grigor et al. does not use terms logical display area, logical common area or input controller. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention add the word logical to the display area or common area and that input controller comprise of items 62,72 (See Fig. 1b) in the Grigor et al. apparatus or method in order to satisfy a need for an improved display system (See Col. 1, Lines 66-67 in the Grigor et al. reference).

As to claim 7, Grigor et al. teaches a method operating multiple data processing systems using a single set of input devices, (See Fig. 1a, items 16,18,30, in description See Col. 3, Lines 4-25); said method comprising: an active data processing system receiving signals from a pointing device within the single set of input devices controlling movement of a cursor within a first display area for the active data processing system (See Figs. 3b, 5a,b items 116,119,128, in description See Col. 6, Lines 36-25); responsive to movement of the cursor past a logical common boundary between the first logical display area and a second, display area of a inactive

Art Unit: 2673

data processing system, active data processing system signaling an input controller coupled to active data processing system and coupled to the inactive data processing system; and in response to signaling by active data processing system, input controller automatically switching transmission of signals from the single set of input devices from the active data processing system to inactive data processing system, such that the inactive data processing system becomes the active data processing system and input signals from the single set of input devices control movement of the cursor within the second display area (See Figs. 1b,3b, 5a,b items 30,62,72,116,119,128, in description See Col. 6, Lines 36-25 and from Col. 3, Line 65 to Col. 4, Line 55).

Grigor et al. does not use terms logical display area, logical common area or input controller. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention add the word logical to the display area or common area and that input controller comprise of items 62,72 (See Fig. 1b) in the Grigor et al. apparatus or method in order to satisfy a need for an improved display system (See Col. 1, Lines 66-67 in the Grigor et al. reference).

As to claim 15, Grigor et al. teaches an automatic input switching device with:

a controller; an input connection within the controller for a single set of input devices including a pointing device; output connections within the input controller for at least two data processing systems; switching logic within the input controller at least two data processing systems transmitting input signals from the single set of input devices to an active data processing system (See Fig. 1a,b, items 62,72 30, in description See from Col. 2, Line 59 to Col. 4, Line 55); wherein the switching logic, responsive to receipt of signaling from the active data processing system indicative of movement of the cursor past a logical common boundary

Art Unit: 2673

between the display area of the active data processing system and a display area for another data processing system, automatically switching transmission of signals from the single set of input devices from the active data processing system to another data processing system, wherein another data processing system becomes the active data processing system (See Figs. 1b,3b, 5a,b items 30,62,72,116,119,128, in description See Col. 6, Lines 36-25 and from Col. 3, Line 65 to Col. 4, Line 55).

Grigor et al. does not use terms logical display area, logical common area or input controller. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention add the word logical to the display area or common area and that input controller comprise of items 62,72 (See Fig. 1b) in the Grigor et al. apparatus or method in order to satisfy a need for an improved display system (See Col. 1, Lines 66-67 in the Grigor et al. reference).

As to claim 2, Grigor et al. teaches a set of data processing systems, wherein the at least two data processing systems with an array of data processing system displays, each data processing system display corresponding to a different data processing system having a logical display area (See Fig. 1a, items 16,18,20,22 in description See from Col. 2, Line 59 to Col. 3, Line 25).

As to claims 6,13-14, Grigor et al. teaches a set of data processing systems with a logical arrangement of display areas for at least two data processing systems which corresponds to a physical configuration of display devices for the at least two data processing systems, wherein logical display areas for data processing systems having physically adjacent display devices share a logical common boundary (See Fig. 5a,b items 34a,b,207 in description See from Col. 6, Line 66 to Col. 7, Line 17).

Art Unit: 2673

Grigor et al. does not use terms logical display area, logical common area. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention add the word logical to the display area or common area in the Grigor et al. apparatus or method in order to satisfy a need for an improved display system (See Col. 1, Lines 66-67 in the Grigor et al. reference).

4. Claims 3, 9, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grigor et al. as aforementioned in claims 1,7,15 in view of Ku et al. (US Patent No. 6,266,236 B1).

Grigor et al. does not show a universal serial bus (USB) connection of a single set of input devices to each data processing system.

Ku et al. teaches a keyboard and a mouse connection using a universal serial bus (See Fig. 1, items 10, 26, in description see Col. 8, Lines 12-21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to add USB for mouse and keyboard connections as shown by Ku et al. in the Grigor et al. apparatus and method in order to satisfy a need for an improved display system (See Col. 1, Lines 66-67 in the Grigor et al. reference).

Response to Amendment

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 01-20-03 with respect to claims 1-3, 6-7, 9, 13-15 and 18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Telephone inquire

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leonid Shapiro whose telephone number is 703-305-5661. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 a.m. to 5 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on 703-305-4938. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2673

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4750.

Is
April 30, 2003



BIPIN CHAWLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600